



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No.

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP.
ATTN: INT77
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212

COPY MAILED

JUN 19 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Michelle C. Clayton	:	
Application No. 10/787,074	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: February 19, 2004	:	PURSUANT TO
Attorney Docket No.: P17730	:	37 C.F.R. § 1.181
Title: GENERATING TOPOLOGY	:	
INFORMATION IDENTIFYING DEVICES	:	
IN A NETWORK TOPOLOGY	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed April 14, 2008, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the notice of non-compliant amendment, mailed November 15, 2007, which set a period for reply of one month. No further responses were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on December 16, 2007. A notice of abandonment was mailed on March 26, 2008.

Section 711.03(c)(I)(A) of the MPEP sets forth, *in toto*:

In Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning

of Delgar is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

With this petition, Petitioner has provided a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the

USPTO, and has established that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. The practitioner has further stated that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including the file jacket and its contents indicated that the Office action was not received. Finally, a copy of the master docket used by the practitioner where the non-received notice of non-compliant amendment would have been entered had it been received has been included.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 is **GRANTED**.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will re-mail the notice of non-compliant amendment of November 15, 2007, and will set a new period for response.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the present decision to ensure that the revival or withdrawal of the holding of abandonment has been acknowledged by the Technology Center in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to any failure of that change in status should be directed to the Technology Center where that change of status must be effected - **the Office of Petitions cannot effectuate a change of status.**

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225¹. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any of Petitioner's further action(s).